

Amdt. Dated June 29, 2007 - 8 -
Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2006

KUO *et al.*
Appl. No. 10/692,821
Atty. Docket: 1875.5310000

Amendments to the Drawings

A new FIG. 3 has been submitted herewith.

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-6, 8, 10-13 are pending in the application, with 1 and 8 being the independent claims. Claims 7 and 9 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 1, 2, 8, and 10 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

The examiner has objected to Figures 1-3 because the examiner believes they should be designated as Prior Art. In accordance with the examiner's objection, Figure 3 has been amended to include a legend that designates it as Prior Art. However, Figures 1-2 have not been amended because Figures 1-2 are not believed to be Prior Art. Figure 1 is a diagram of a broadband communication system. As shown, Figure 1 includes Broadband Modem 114. Figure 2 is a diagram of Broadband Modem 114. As shown, Figure 2 includes Hybrid Circuit 230. Hybrid Circuit 230 includes Hybrid Circuits 230 shown in Figure 4 and Hybrid Circuit 230 shown in Figure 5. Hybrid Circuits 230 of Figures 4 and 5 are not believed to be Prior Art. Because Figures 1-2 can comprise elements that are not believed to be Prior Art, they are not believed to be Prior Art and should not be designated as such.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 2, and 10. Claims 1, 2, and 10 have been amended according to the examiner's suggestions. Withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11-14 have been rejected as being anticipated by Conroy et al. (US Patent 6,870,928 B1).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 7. In the outstanding Office Action the Examiner indicated that claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Because claim 1, as amended, is an independent claim that contains the subject matter of claim 7, claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 3-6 are dependent on claim 1 and as such are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 3-6 are respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 8 has also been amended to include the subject matter of claim 7. For the reason stated above in accordance with the description of claim 1, claim 8 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 8 is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 has been canceled.

Claims 10-13 are dependent on claim 8 and as such are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 10-13 are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conroy et al. (US Patent 6,870,928 B1) as applied to claim 1, and in further view of Harrington et al. (US Patent 6,163,579).

Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and as such, for the reasons stated above, is also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 2 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conroy et al. (US Patent 6,870,928 B1) as applied to claim 9, and in further view of Harrington et al. (US Patent 6,163,579).

Claim 10 is dependent on claim 8 and as such, for the reasons stated above, is also believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Amdt. Dated June 29, 2007 - 12 -
Reply to Office Action of December 29, 2006

KUO *et al.*
Appl. No. 10/692,821
Atty. Docket: 1875.5310000

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michael D. Specht
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 54,463

Date: 6/29/07

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
629936_2.DOC